



Coos Bay District RAC meeting Project Recommendations August 4, 2005

DRAFT

RAC Members:

Category 1

Mike Smith
Sharon Waterman
Timm Slater
Amy Peters (absent)
Fred Arnold (absent)
Mark Villers (absent)
Ron Robinson (absent)

Category 2

John Griffith (chair)
Bob Kinyon
Helen Franklin
Penny Lind
Gordon Ross
Adela New (absent)
Janice Green (absent)

Category 3

George Smith
Jan Tetreault
Fred Green
Bill Town
Ralph Brown
Sally Town
Gary DeSalvatore

Coos Bay BLM Members present:

Sue Richardson – DFO
Glenn Harkleroad
Megan Slothower
Aimee Hoefs
Pat Ryan
Pat Olmstead
Kip Wright
Dennis Turowski
Elaine Raper
Dan Van Slyke
Dale Stewart
Kathy Wall
Joel Robb
Reg Pullen

Public present:

Bruce Miller
Robin Sears
Ed Vaughn
Jennifer Hampel
Harry Hoogesteger
Ron Adams

Call to Order:

John Griffith called the meeting to order at 9:03 am.
The RAC and audience members introduced themselves.

Review Minutes:

Jan Tetreault made motion to approve the 6/28/05 meeting minutes.
Helen Franklin seconded.
Minutes approved.

BLM Report:

Glenn Harkleroad: Minutes from last meeting completed and supplied to RAC. Provided other information to RAC members as requested.

Review of Projects:

Began with county that contributed the most Title II funding first – **Douglas Co.**
Elected not to begin with Multi-County projects as had been done in previous rounds.

Project: Coastal Science Zones

Discussion:

Jan Tetreault: This project is near to her heart. This project is an off-shoot of Science Zone projects in Douglas County. It's a learning process that targets young people who are interested in sustainable forestry.

Helen Franklin: Umpqua Discovery Center is one of the best facilities on the coast.

Jan Tetreault: Lenny Schussel is connected to project and she realizes that this is a concern for some RAC members. The project doesn't qualify for Title III funding, because Title III funds to be used for after school programs. This project would involve Reedsport schools. Elliot State Forest is a cooperator.

Jan requested to have the following added to the minutes to clarify her input at the time:

Jan Tetreault spoke strongly in favor of the project, the purpose of which is to train young people in forest technology that they may find employment in forestry after completing their formal education. Many volunteer hours have already been invested in the process, several youth have expressed interest in continuing with water quality testing and forest management on the ground. The Elliott State Forest, Ash Valley residents, Reedsport Schools and the Discovery Center in Reedsport are involved along with Dr. Lenny Schussel of ONRRI.

Penny Lind: Money in budget goes to logistics and money for lunches. No charges for students. Some overhead for Discovery Center.

Jan Tetreault: Would like to get BLM involved in this project.
(BLM is already involved in the project approved last year.)

George Smith : How is funding split between counties in multi-county projects?

Glenn Harkleroad: That is up to the discretion of the RAC.

Vote:

Category 1: 2, fail Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 4, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Council Capacity Building - UBWC

Discussion:

Helen Franklin: Thinks it is a worthy project. The watershed council addresses the issue of project engineering and they plan on bringing an engineer on board to help design projects. One of the biggest problems with watershed projects that the RAC has reviewed in the past is a lack of engineering.

Vote:

Category 1: 2, fail Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 3, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Dean Creek Elk Stewardship Support

Discussion:

Penny Lind: The project has good partners and a good plan with objectives. Supports the project.

Timm Slater: Dean Creek is a major attraction. Anything we can do to enhance it is good for tourism.

Bill Town: In favor.

John Griffith: Why aren't there enough trees to make the project self-sufficient?

Glenn Harkleroad: This is Coos Bay BLM's first attempt at stewardship and we wanted to start small. Also there are aesthetic concerns at this highly visible sight. Kip Wright asked to comment.

Kip Wright: There are not a lot of flat areas in the uplands to make meadows. Trees being offered for sale are small and not high value.

John Griffith: Are there other, more merchantable, trees that can be harvested in the project area?

Kip Wight: There are, but a road system would be needed to access them.

Jan Tetreault: Wondered why Dean Creek is not self-supporting from tourism. BLM should look to sell books, T-shirts, etc. in order to help pay for projects at Dean Creek. Also, BLM doing things (dredging) at Dean Creek that those who own wetlands can not do.

Gordon Ross: I don't see why the BLM can't make money from agricultural products (forage / hay) at Dean Creek. Would like to see the land managed better where BLM doesn't have to spend so much money to make the Stewardship project happen.

Helen Franklin: Past land managers found that the elk left when the area was being managed as wetland. It would great if BLM could start selling forage off of the land at the Elk Viewing Site.

Jan Tetreault: Is concerned that Dean Creek projects from “Round 4” are not completed.

Helen Franklin: Contracting process changes have held things up.

Glenn Harkleroad: After “Round 4” projects were approved, the project designs were finalized and sent up to the State Office for contract solicitation. Once the funding is approved it takes some time to get a project on the ground.

Mike Smith: Likes the project because it is an effort to implement a stewardship contract. Would like to see more of the agency’s allocated money to support project. For Title II it is a lower priority than other projects.

Fred Green: How much timber is involved in Dean Creek? Why isn’t BLM conducting thinnings in the forest around Dean Creek?

Kip Wright: A lot of the timber in the area is in a younger age class.

Fred Green: There is enough timber there to support the project.

Penny Lind: The Dean Creek Elk Viewing Area is designed to be different than a fiber farm. Don’t lose sight of what the purpose of this site is. There are other areas within the District for producing wood fiber.

Ralph Brown: Because of tourism, the counties are expected to subsidize these types of projects. Thinks that some of the tourism based areas need to help fund their management.

Jan Tetreault: Mentioned the possibility of establishing an interpretive center project at Dean Creek. There are a lot of opportunities to raise funding without even having to cut a tree.

John Griffith: Looking at elk doesn’t pay its way. Shooting them does.

Vote:

Category 1: 0, fail Category 2: 2, fail Category 3: 2, fail

Project not recommended

Project: Dean Creek Elk Viewing Area Noxious Weeds Treatment

Discussion:

John Griffith: Does the project allow the use of herbicides?

Glenn Harkleroad: The project is cutting and hand pulling of weeds.

Gordon Ross: What weeds are being treated in this project?

Kip Wright: scotchbroom, tansy, thistle.

Helen Franklin: Hand pulling of thistle is very difficult. You have to get the roots to be successful and they can be up to 30 feet long. Not going to control thistle by hand pulling.

Mike Smith: Has concerns about funding so many weed projects. We are becoming a weed pulling funding organization. Thinks weeds are a problem, but if funding sources dry up you can't be after them constantly. Would like to fund projects that are long term and fund people / organizations who will stay after the weeds in the long run. Worried about spending money on a one time project.

Penny Lind: Would like to see a proposal that is broader in scope.

John Griffith: If you can get to weeds before they seed, manual removal (over time) can work.

Gordon Ross: County efforts have brought about greater awareness of weeds in the public.

Jan Tetreault: Would like to see projects coordinated with State Weed Board.

Helen Franklin: Agrees with Jan. Would rather fund ongoing projects with long term monitoring. The smaller projects have concerns for long-term commitment.

Helen Franklin: Can BLM co-fund the project? Wants to see commitment from agency for long-term maintenance

Elaine Raper: Currently at Dean Creek BLM's management is really in a restoration phase. The BLM will be able to continue with on-going maintenance after get we handle on the current weed population.

Jan Tetreault: Is this a follow-up to what we voted on last year? Is this an on-going treatment? (Yes)

Bill Town: You would have found no evergreen blackberries in this area in the 40s and 50s. New weeds come in every year and we have almost no way to slow the spread of these weeds. If we don't take steps to control or eliminate them as they come in, it is only going to get worse. In favor of trying to control these weeds to the best of our ability.

Vote:

Category 1: 1, fail Category 2: 4, pass Category 3: 4, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Half-way Creek Road/Channel Reroute

Discussion:

Gordon Ross: Are you straightening (the stream) or making it crooked?

Pat Olmstead: We are proposing to restore access to a river bend that was cut off during road construction. The river was straightened when road was built. The current condition limits fish access into Halfway Creek. If implemented, the project will accommodate fish access at all flows.

John Griffith: Who are the local land owners?

Pat Olmstead : BLM manages the upper reaches. Roseburg Resources also owns land in that vicinity.

John Griffith: Who owns the lower reaches?

Pat Olmstead: BLM manages them

Mike Smith: Is it quality habitat in that area?

Pat Olmstead: Yes.

John Griffith: Any estimates on the stream's productivity right now?

Pat Olmstead: Yes. It does get frequent fish use.

Penny Lind: Is this proposal able to meet these high end goals or will you have to go back to do more?

Pat Olmstead: There are two parts. Restoring channel and on-going road maintenance.

Jan Tetreault: What type of low water crossing will be used and will it create more sediment?

Pat Olmstead: An armored low water crossing would be installed. Currently the BLM engineers are reviewing a couple of options before settling on a final design. It will be a hardened low water crossing that will blend into the exposed bed rock.

Helen Franklin: Likes portions of projects. Has a problem with restoration portions. Have you thoroughly researched that juvenile fish have not been able to get into the stream?

Pat Olmstead: At very low or high flows, juvenile fish could not get back into Halfway Creek because of their low jump performance.

Gordon Ross: Likes projects that keep road access. However, there are other projects that cost a lot less money and produce a bigger gain.

Gary DeSalvatore: Do you have any fish count data and what are projected results after project?

Pat Olmstead: Doesn't have information right at hand but data is available.

Gary DeSalvatore: General concern – It makes the job of evaluating projects much more difficult when we don't have data. Would like to see more data included in future project submissions. Currently, the RAC's decision-making process is in-defensible.

Helen Franklin: Feels that requiring a lot of data in the project submissions puts an undo burden on people who put the projects together. RAC members have an option to call project proponents and get data before the meeting.

Mike Smith: Agrees with Helen Franklin. The RAC has to have faith in the project proponents.

Dennis Turowski: It would be beneficial to discuss cost savings relative to other alternatives in the project proposal.

John Griffith: Obviously a low water crossing would be the least expensive option.

Jan Tetreault: Are we hurting the fish that at the same time we are trying to help?

Pat Olmstead : There is not a culvert made that could fit this sight. The only other option is a bridge which is very expensive. A low water crossing facilitates road access and fish passage

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended.

Project: Hinsdale Slough Ditch Cleaning

Discussion:

Gordon Ross: Sounds like good agricultural project.

Jan Tetreault: Ditch dredging products are saleable. Is there any possibility of selling products?

Helen Franklin: It's likely cost prohibitive to separate the saleable items out.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 2, fail

Project not recommended.

Project: Loon Lake Water Weed Control

Discussion:

Jan Tetreault: Project should be coordinated with other boat launch areas. This project only proposes taking weeds out around BLM areas. Are you going to sell weeds? I'd be willing to buy them.

Helen Franklin: Complements to Kathy Wall – well written project. Aquatic weeds are serious problem. Likes the lay out of the project.

Penny Lind: Sets a good example. May help bring in partners in the future... projects for the whole lake.

Jan Tetreault: Why wasn't it put together to include partners at this time?

Elaine Raper: Project has been successful in the past for recreation-related safety. BLM only has control over areas we manage. Intent of project is to maintain areas where folks are recreating. We can look at options for partnering in the future.

Ralph Brown: How long do you expect cleaned area to remain weed free?

Dan VanSlyke: Weed removal will occur twice a year.

Ralph Brown: Encouraged BLM to seek additional sources of funding.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 4, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended.

Public comment period:

Harry Hoogesteger: Provided details about the Bethel creek project. The project is unanimously supported by the Curry County Commissioners. The project was proposed by the landowner. It has a direct benefit to federal land at New River. The project's goal is to restore Bethel Creek to a more natural channel. Title II funding would be used for excavator time, transport and placement of large wood in the stream, purchasing of whole trees, planting local tree species, labor, and monitoring. All funding would be spent locally. Project permits are already obtained.

John Griffith: Did the landowner propose the project? (Yes)

Ron Adams:

Passed out 2004 annual report from OYCC. The vision is to create a "line in the sand", drive all noxious weeds back into California. The idea behind the project is to get kids on

the ground, working on noxious weeds projects. OYCC has been successful in receiving some Title II funding from every RAC solicited. We realize that this is more than a one year project (to be successful). Any Title II funding allocated will be helping kids in local communities do work on the ground.

Helen Franklin: Would like to see the correct language used when working with the kids. i.e. noxious vs. invasive weeds.

Bob Kinyon: Are you associated with a school?

Ron Adams: We have been affiliated with alternative schools in Brookings and Coos Bay.

Mike Smith: Are you from a state agency? Where do you receive funding?

Ron Adams: Yes. Receive money from lottery funding, state parks and marine boards.

Mike Smith: What sort of administrative support do you have? (3 people)

Mike Smith: Do you pay youth to work?

(Yes, Crew leads – \$11-\$13/HR, workers min. wage.)

Project: Paradise Creek Watershed Restoration

Discussion:

Bill Town: Would partial funding be acceptable?

Bob Kinyon: OWEB did recommend a portion of the funding needed for the whole project. Match is secured. The project is located within a Key Watershed and will restore 12 miles of stream. Lots of effort put into planning. This project received my highest rating.

Gordon Ross: Was the stream clean because of fire, flood, and /or contractors?
(Yes, all of the above).

Mike Smith: Can't we make the people who took logs out of stream to pay for project?

Dan VanSlyke: This is a large scale project, using helicopter, and restoring lots of habitat. There is a tremendous amount of participation from the landowners within the watershed. Roseburg Resources is big supporter.

John Griffith: What about Arsenal?

Dan VanSlyke: He is a big supporter.

Jan Tetreault: The Umpqua Soil and Water Conservation District did work on Arsenalt's and in Paradise Creek. We've gained habitat because projects of past did some good. These projects also included good landowner participation.

Helen Franklin: Is it possible to turn it into multi-year project, less funding this year.

Dan VanSlyke: It's hard to know. However, it would be more cost effective to do the project in one year rather than multi-year. We can scale back if necessary, but cost per unit effort would go up.

Glenn Harkleroad: BLM has already received approval to waive overhead fees if OWEB money comes to BLM to administer contracts. This is a cost saving to the project.

Bob Kinyon: The project is currently expected to pass the OWEB board with full support. RAC support would have some impact.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 4, pass

Project recommended.

Project: Russel Creek Culvert

Discussion:

Helen Franklin: How damaged is culvert?

Pat Olmstead: There are two culverts, and their capacity has been reduced by plugging. They're not hanging on by thread, but another bad year could cause problems.

Helen Franklin: Doesn't seem from picture that culvert is in bad shape and may be able to remove clogging materials.

Penny Lind: What are landscape conditions around the project area?

Pat Olmstead: Young forest, lots of alder, culvert has few miles of stream above it. The streambed frequently scours.

Vote:

Category 1: 0, fail Category 2: 1, fail Category 3: 1, fail

Project not recommended.

Project: South Sisters Structure Placement

Discussion:

Mike Smith: How has the Smith River Watershed Council been performing?
(They have been performing well. Glenn gave some examples)

Helen Franklin: Likes matching component. Supports project.

Timm Slater: The RAC has funded projects in that area that have been accomplished. Therefore, it makes sense to fund this project.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended.

Project: Structure Placement 2006 - UBWC

Discussion:

Helen Franklin: Great project.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended.

Project: USWCD Water Quality Monitoring

Discussion:

John Griffith: Requested briefing.

Bill Town: Provided briefing on project.

Robin Sears: Has done research on the intended benefit of this grant. It is expected to be an important project to help de-list some of the 303d listed streams in Smith River.

Helen Franklin: Stated that she was impressed with methodology detailed in the project proposal.

Mike Smith: How much of matching funded is committed?
(None at this time)

Helen Franklin: Have you asked for DEQ funding? (No)

Bill Town: The Umpqua Soil and Water Conservation District reduced size of project because of personnel changes. Seeking enough money to get the project started.

Mike Smith: We would be funding this project in total? (Yes)

Timm Slater: Does DEQ accept your data as valid?
(Consulted DEQ about project designs, but have not discussed this project per se)

Timm Slater: Data would only be used to de-list the streams.

Jan Tetreault: Have to follow DEQ criteria / protocol to conduct project. Conservation District needs this project money. They will definitely be working with DEQ.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 3, pass

Project recommended.

Project: W. Fork Salmonid Trap

Discussion:

John Griffith: Can you do the project with the \$21,261 that remains?

Bruce Miller: ODFW does have long term commitment to the trap and would have to explore alternative funding if not fully funded here. The traps monitor both adults and juveniles. The goal is to establish long term population trends.

Mike Smith: We can approve projects that we don't fund with our money.

Sue Richardson: Such an action would amount to a show of support for the project and public input, basically a vote of confidence.

Helen Franklin: Didn't like how project was written up. The write up didn't address details of the project. Does study include all salmon stocks? It is essential to coordinate study with all stream enhancement projects.

Pat Olmstead: We have been providing detail in monthly and yearly reports. These have been forward by Glenn to the RAC.

Helen Franklin: It is hard for us to make the connection to those reports when reviewing projects.

Jan Tetreault: It would be easy to include the last couple of reports with projects... for our reference.

John Griffith: How many years of data have been collected? Is it important to the Oregon Plan? How much of a commitment does ODFW have?

(Began in 1998 as stream monitoring program under the Oregon Plan. The project represents a large commitment to long-term monitoring.)

Penny Lind: How are private landowners involved?

(The trap site is constructed on Roseburg resources site. The project includes interagency and private/agency cooperation.)

George Smith: Why is it shown as one year project, not multi-year?

Pat Olmstead: It is difficult to get this project fully funded, so I have my “hands in many pockets.” We have been pursuing full funding every year from various sources. It is a multi-year project, but we have been making requests year to year because we don’t know what amount to request for any given year. It is further complicated by the money being needed a year ahead.

Helen Franklin: How much has OWEB funded?

(We have not requested OWEB funding as they focus on capital improvement projects.)

Note: The vote would be to give the remaining funding to this project.

Sharon Waterman: Clarification - If this project is funded project, there will be no Douglas County funding to carry forward to multi-year projects? (correct)

Vote: Category 1: 2, fail Category 2: 2, fail Category 3: 3, pass
Project not recommended.

Bob Kinyon: Would like to resurrect the Umpqua Basin Watershed Council capacity building project for reconsideration. The Council would use remaining funding well and is important to the success of the Council’s other projects.

Vote:
Category 1: 1, fail Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 3, pass
Project not recommended.

Coos County Projects

Project: Forest Land Protection – Noxious Weeds

Discussion:

Jan Tetreault: Is this effort coordinated with weed board?

(It is the primary funding for the weed board)

Jan Tetreault: Has a concern about dead weeds along roadsides and associated fire danger. What methods are you using?

(The Coos County Road Dept. tries to use multiple methods.)

Jan Tetreault: Would like to see projects coordinated with State Weed Board

Helen Franklin: The County does coordinate with State Weed Board.

John Griffith: The County did do one joint venture and hand pulled in portions of Highway 42.

Penny Lind: Is the \$85,000 all for contracting?

Glenn Harkleroad: The \$85,000 shown as contracting funds, represents the money that will be allocated to an assistance agreement and used to do project work. Probably need to expand the budget line items so it would be clearer.

Penny Lind: Agreed that the budget should be broken down more in the future.

George Smith: What proportion of the weed advisory board does this funding represent?

Helen Franklin: It represents about 2/3 of the weed advisory board's budget.

George Smith: What sort impact would not having this funding have on the weed advisory board?

Helen Franklin: It would kill the board. It would end our roadside program.

Helen Franklin: The weed advisory board is trying to not be solely dependent on RAC funding. We are trying to find other funding possibilities.

George Smith: Is this the project we've funded every year? (Yes).

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended.

Project: Belloni Boys Ranch Youth Projects

Discussion:

Mike Smith: Does The Boy's Ranch have affiliation with county? (No)

Helen Franklin: Coos County is not the sponsor of this project. That is an error as listed on the project proposal.

John Griffith: The kids involved in this program are there on committal. They have to show improvement in behavior. They earn a small stipend

.

Mike Smith: How much do the kids get paid?

Helen Franklin: Well behaved kids get to go to work in the program and get \$5/HR.

Penny Lind: Is budget reflective of the total cost of project? (No)

Penny Lind: Is this part of Coos County's roadside county program?
(No, it is an independent program.)

Penny Lind: Are these projects only on roads? (Yes)

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended.

Project: Big Creek Sandy Tie Road Renovation

Discussion:

Helen Franklin: Is this a log hauling road where usage fees are collected? Would like to see in-kind contribution from BLM for hauling portions.

Joel Robb: The road was built in 30's. The portion considered in this project has never had logs hauled across it.

Helen Franklin: how will Plum Creek benefit?
(It is a short cut between management areas)

Helen Franklin: Why didn't Plum Creek contribute financially to the project?

Joel Robb: Plum Creek improved roads on their property. They have done their fair share for roads in the area.

Gordon Ross: Will there be a reciprocal agreement between BLM and Plum Creek?

Joel Robb: Yes. The area also receives high recreation traffic.

Helen Franklin: Is this a high priority for the tribe?

George Smith: Yes. It is also a high priority for CFPA

Penny Lind: Is this a kind of project that doesn't need monitoring?

Joel Robb: Monitoring would consist of the road maintenance crew driving through. They could make corrections / do minor maintenance as needed.

Gordon Ross: If the road is improved, is their money for maintenance? (Yes)

George Smith: The tribe has agreed to contribute to maintenance of this road

Ralph Brown: It appears that the main use of this road is for recreation access. How much recreation access is there on this road?

George Smith: A lot of hunters and fishers use this road. It gets heavy traffic. If not fixed, there is a potential for problems associated sediment delivery to streams and a loss of access.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 4, pass Category 3: 4, pass

Project recommended.

LUNCH BREAK

Project: Coquille Forest Interpretive Signs

Discussion:

George Smith: This is the only project the tribe is bringing forward this year.

Ed Vaughn gave a briefing on the project.

Vote:

Category 1: 2, fail Category 2: 4, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Dement Creek Watershed Enhancement

Discussion:

Jan Tetreault: Has the project begun?

Jennifer Hampel: Project planning / design has been started. NEPA has been completed. This is a multi-year project.

Bob Kinyon: Previous restoration projects on Dement Creek are working well. This is a good project.

George Smith: Coho salmon are not federally listed. This is an error in the project proposal.

Helen Franklin: Question to Jennifer Hampel - Of the Coquille Watershed Association's two projects (Dement Creek or Noxious Weed project) being considered by the RAC, which one is your highest priority?

Jennifer Hampel: The Watershed Association has OWEB funding for Dement Creek and would like to see happen... but if forced to decided between the two it's probably more important to do the noxious weed project now.

Gary DeSalvatore: This project has property owner support. Stated that he has seen the project on a field tour and it is impressive.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 2, fail Category 3: 3, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Karl's Creek Waterhole

Discussion:

Jan Tetreault: Would this project be eligible for title III? (No)

Helen Franklin: Why isn't there cooperative sharing with HFRI? What is the urgency?

(Idea is to improve waterhole and access, HFRI could be pursued, but submitted to RAC because of deadline, but also a good fit for RAC because of road and sediment issues. BLM has not explored funding opportunities through the fire organization.)

Dale Stewart: This project was proposed last year and not funded. This year we included the small amount of road decommissioning and approached the project from a restorative perspective. This waterhole is valuable because it is associated with a stream and provides water year round.

John Griffith: Is it functional now?

Dale Stewart: You can get to it seasonally, but would have to set up a pump in the stream to get water to the trucks. This project would improve year-round road access to the pump chance.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 4, pass

Project recommended.

Project: MFO Roadside Noxious Weed Treatment

Discussion:

Jan Tetreault: Has questions about the timeframes and said the project doesn't make much sense... lots of inconsistencies.

Helen Franklin: The timing inconsistencies are due to weather considerations.

Mike Smith: Does the Coos County weed advisory board support this project?

Helen Franklin: Yes, but the board is hoping BLM could kick in in-kind for some portion of the project, such as monitoring.

Jan Tetreault: There is no funding from any other groups.

Penny Lind: Stated she really appreciated projects that included maps... this project would have benefited from having good maps.

Helen Franklin: Is it possible to do some of the project with partial funding?

(Yes. Project cost consideration reduced to \$37,000)

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 2, fail Category 3: 2, fail

Project not recommended

Project: North Fork Coquille Noxious Weed Removal

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote:

Category 1: 2, fail Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 3, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Pilot Restoration of New River Shoreline

Discussion:

Mike Smith: Can anyone speak to the potential success of this project? Seems like a waste of money.

Pat Ryan: This project is associated with the New River breaching project the RAC has funded in the past. Trying to establish test plots to see if American Dune Grass can replace European Beach Grass.

Mike Smith: Has European Beach Grass led to the breachings? (No)

Helen Franklin: American Beach Grass still has rhizomes and there is no way to fully get rid of the European Beach Grass. You'll just be exchanging one problem for another.

Jan Tetreault: Not true... European Beach Grass much more grabbing and more aggressive than the native grass.

John Griffith: If you would be planting native grasses to stabilize dunes there is the possibility that European Beach Grass would again take over.

Pat: Yes, it is a possibility, but this would just be a test.

Vote:

Category 1: 0, fail Category 2: 2, fail Category 3: 3, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Upper South Fork Elk Creek Large Wood

Discussion:

No discussion

Vote:

Category 1: 0, fail Category 2: 1, fail Category 3: 0, fail

Project not recommended.

Project: Upper South Fork Elk Noxious Weed Elimination

Discussion:

No discussion

Vote:

Category 1: 1, fail Category 2: 1, fail Category 3: 3, pass

Project not recommended.

Project: Yankee Run

Discussion:

Penny Lind: Was this project funded before?

(Other projects in Yankee Run Creek have been funded by Title II funds before.)

Sharon Waterman: Is there money coming from timber companies who use the roads?
(It is a shared road. Timber companies contribute money for use, but the money goes to National Treasury)

George Smith: Is this a BLM road? (Yes)

George Smith: Have the local timber companies been approached to contribute funds?
(No, since paving, an upgrade, is proposed)

Gordon Ross: Does this come into county road? (Yes, the Wagon Road and the Myrtle Point to Sitkum County Road)

John Griffith: What is Nikki Moore's opinion of this project?
(Nikki Moore and Pam Olson are both supportive of the project.)

John Griffith: The BLM has done several projects and the RAC has supported several projects in the yankee run area.

Joel Robb: Clarified how road fees are collected and used on the District.

Helen Franklin: Feel that this is beneficial to private industry and that industry hasn't done their fair share in regards to road maintenance. Stated that she would like to see more cooperation from the timber industry on projects like this.

Penny Lind: Asked clarification on project budget.

Gordon Ross: Stated that he believes industry land is being managed better and that industry is doing maintenance on their roads. Industry is doing the heavy lifting in the management of watersheds.

Sharon Waterman: Is there a possibility for BLM to cover \$11,000 in support of this project?

Helen Franklin: Have you explored chip and seal options for this road?

Joel Robb: Chip sealing doesn't hold up like asphalt, so it would not be a good option for this road.

Ralph Brown: Would this finish restoration work in Yankee Run Creek?
(There isn't a whole lot left to do and this would come close to, if not completely, wrapping up restoration needs in Yankee Run Creek).

Motion for RAC to fund \$44,000 for this project.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended at \$44,000

Sharon Waterman: Would like to revisit the North Fork Coquille noxious weed project because of confusion about the project earlier.

Jan Tetreault: What treatment methods will be used?

Jennifer Hampel: Japanese Knotweed will be hand pulled. No stem inoculation will occur because of prohibitive cost.

Mike Smith: What is the long term plan?

Jennifer Hampel: We have a commitment for 15 years to continue maintenance. This project funding request is a first shot to get it knocked down... then we will plant trees.

Helen Franklin: Have you heard back on your request for OWEB funding?

Jennifer Hampel: OWEB funding will be pursued in October.

Jan Tetreault: What are you going to do to dispose of the weeds?

Jennifer Hampel: The weeds will be hauled off and burned. This should reduce spread on that site.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 4, pass

Project recommended.

George Smith: Requested to revisit the Coquille Tribe's interpretive sign project. Proposed to drop the Title II funding request down to \$10,000.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended at \$10,000

Bill Town: Requested to allocate the remaining \$34,464 to the Dement Creek project.

Helen Franklin: Why is it priority?

Bill Town: The project area could be even better with more large woody debris. The area receives heavy use by coho and other fish.

Gary DeSalvatore: I would like to see more balance in the allocation of funds for different types of projects. The Dement Creek project offers an opportunity to provide this balance.

Jan Tetreault: Will the reduced amount of funding accomplish enough of the work to provide a benefit?

Jennifer Hampel: Yes. We would just do fewer sites.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 3, pass Category 3: 5, pass

Project recommended for \$34, 464

Curry County Projects

Glenn Harkleroad: BLM can take \$1,366 out of its recommended overhead funding and this would allow the RAC to recommend full funding for all of the Curry County projects. If that is desirable.

Sharon Waterman: I have a question about first Curry County project. Will road closures have any impact on fire fighting?

(Roads closures will not be expected to significantly affect fire fighting abilities.)

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 5, pass Category 3: 4, pass

All Curry County projects recommended at listed amounts and BLM will contribute \$1,366 from overhead to make projects whole.

Multi-County Projects

Bob Kinyon: Recommended that rest of the funding be put towards the multi-county OYCC invasive weed eradication project.

John Griffith: Asked if there is anyone available to address the Northwest Youth Corp project.

(No one from NYC was present)

Reg Pullen: Commented about BLM's and NYC's past working relationship and the value of having them as a partner.

John Griffith: The NYC project does not display the amount of match (funding or in-kind) that they are providing.

Note: Vote is on the motion to put the remaining \$21,261 of Douglas County Title II funding into the multi-county OYCC invasive weed eradication project.

Vote:

Category 1: 3, pass Category 2: 4, pass Category 3: 3, pass

Project recommended at \$21,261.

Meeting Close out:

The next RAC meeting will be on either 2/16/06 or 2/23/06. As the meeting date gets closer Glenn will solicit a preferred meeting date from the RAC membership. The meeting will be held at the Ellen Warring Learning Center at the New River ACEC. That meeting will include a business portion in the morning and a project field trip in the afternoon.

General comments captured about projects and project binders:

Include vicinity map with project proposals.

Have individual tabs between project non-stapled proposals in the binder.

Have more project related data and an explanation of projected project outcomes in proposals.

Expand project budget line items on proposal forms.

If you have any other suggestions for improving or editing the project proposal form please let Glenn know.